

**Amendments to the Drawings:**

The attached sheet of drawings includes changes to Figure 9. This sheet, which includes Figure 9, replaces the original sheet including Figure 9. In Figure 9, a legend reading “Prior Art” has been added.

Attachment: Replacement Sheet  
Annotated Sheet Showing Changes

### **REMARKS**

The present paper is in response to the Office Action. Claims 1-8, 10 and 13-15 are amended and claims 9 and 12 is cancelled herein. Claims 1-8, 10 and 13-15 remain pending in view of the above amendments and claim cancellations.

Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested in view of the above amendments to the claims and the following remarks. For the Examiner's convenience and reference, Applicant's remarks are presented in the order in which the corresponding issues were raised in the Office Action.

Please note that the following remarks are not intended to be an exhaustive enumeration of the distinctions between any cited references and the claimed invention. Rather, the distinctions identified and discussed below are presented solely by way of example to illustrate some of the differences between the claimed invention and the cited references. In addition, Applicant requests that the Examiner carefully review any references discussed below to ensure that Applicant's understanding and discussion of the references, if any, is consistent with the Examiner's understanding.

#### **I. Amended Drawings**

The Examiner objects to Figure 9 on the grounds that the figure is not designated by a legend such as "--Prior Art--". *See* Office Action, page 2. Applicant submits new Figure 9 which is designated by a legend reading "Prior Art." Also enclosed is an annotated copy of Figure 9 showing the change being made. In light of this replacement Figure 9, Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner's objection has been overcome and should be withdrawn.

#### **II. Claim Objections**

The Examiner objects to claim 14 because there is no readily ascertainable antecedent basis for "first and second contact pads." *See* Office Action, page 3. In light of Applicant's amendment to claim 14 herein, Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner's objection has been overcome and should be withdrawn

#### **III. PRIOR ART REJECTIONS**

**A. Rejection of claims 1-3, 5-7 and 13 Under 35 U.S.C. §102b**

The Examiner rejects claims 1-3, 5-7 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by *Horn, et al.* (United States Patent No. 3,104,282). Because *Horn* does not teach or suggest each and every element of the rejected claims as amended, Applicants\ respectfully traverses this rejection in view of the following remarks.

In rejecting claims 1-3, 5-7 and 13 as anticipated by *Horn*, the Examiner characterizes the element labeled 96a as a flexible conductor arrangement and the element labeled 174 as an optoelectronic component. *See* Office Action, page 4. The Examiner cites figures 2, 4, 4A, and 5 in support of this characterization of *Horn*. However, it is clear from the portions of *Horn* cited by the Examiner that element 96a does not define “an opening through which light can enter or leave” that is “defined opposite” an optical window which is part of element 174. *See* element labeled 174 in figure 2; *see also* element labeled 96a in figures 2 and 11.

In direct contrast, the rejected claim 1, as amended herein, explicitly recites “an optoelectronic component comprising terminal contacts and an optical window through which light can enter or leave the optoelectronic component” as well as “a flexible conductor arrangement...wherein the flexible conductor arrangement defines an opening through which light can enter or leave, the opening defined opposite the optical window.” At least because the Examiner has not demonstrated that *Horn* teaches a flexible conductor arrangement that “defines an opening through which light can enter or leave” as recited in amended claim 1, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) of independent claim 1, and dependent claims 2-3, 5-7 and 13, be withdrawn.

**B. Rejection of claims 1-4, 8, 13, and 14 Under 35 U.S.C. §102b**

The Examiner rejects claims 1-4, 8, 13 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by *Kawaguchi, et al.* (United States Patent No. 5,243,453). Because *Kawaguchi* does not teach or suggest each and every element of the rejected claims, Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection in view of the following remarks.

In rejecting claims 1-4, 8 and 13 as anticipated by *Kawaguchi*, the Examiner characterizes the element labeled 8 as a flexible conductor arrangement and the element labeled

3 as an optoelectronic component. *See* Office Action, page 5. The Examiner cites figures 2-5, column 3 lines 28-57, and column 4 lines 40-60 in support of this characterization of *Kawaguchi*. However, it is clear from the portions of *Kawaguchi* cited by the Examiner that element 8 does not define “an opening through which light can enter or leave” that is “defined opposite” an optical window which is part of element. *See* elements labeled 3 and 8 in figure 3.

In direct contrast, as discussed above in Section B, the rejected claim 1, as amended, explicitly recites “a flexible conductor arrangement...wherein the flexible conductor arrangement defines an opening through which light can enter or leave...” At least because the Examiner has not demonstrated that *Kawaguchi* teaches a flexible conductor arrangement that “defines an opening through which light can enter or leave” as recited in amended claim 1, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) of independent claim 1, and dependent claims 2-4, 8 and 13, be withdrawn.

In rejecting independent claim 14 the Examiner states “*Kawaguchi* et al. discloses ... a printed circuit board 5; an optoelectronic component 3...and a flexible flat cable 8 ...wherein...the flexible cable extends around the optoelectronic component 3.” Office Action, pages 6-7. The Examiner again cites figures 2-5, column 3 lines 28-57, and column 4 lines 40-60 in support of this characterization of *Kawaguchi*.

Contrary to the Examiner’s characterization, however, none of the portions of *Kawaguchi* cited by the Examiner teach the that element 8 “extends around” the element 3. On the contrary, *Kawaguchi* teaches in figure 1 an operating panel of a washing machine where “a crystal display section 3 is provided on the left-hand side of the operating panel” and “an operating section 5 is disposed on the right hand side.” Column 3 lines 3-6. Therefore, after being assembled into the operating panel of the washing machine illustrated in figure 1, element 5 is oriented next to, and roughly in the same plane as, element 3. All portions of *Kawaguchi* cited by the Examiner, save figure 2 of *Kawaguchi*, discuss the arrangement of the operating panel illustrated in figure 1. “The operating section 5 described below is arranged to be suitable for the washing machine shown in FIG. 1.” Column 3 lines 25-27.

Therefore, *Kawaguchi* does not teach that element 8 “extends around” element 3 when assembled into the operating panel of figure 1. Instead, since elements 5 and 3 lie in roughly the same plane in the operating panel of figure 1, it is not at all clear that any portion of element 8

would “extend[] around” any portion of element 3 when element 8 is operably connected to elements 3 and 5. In addition, it is clear that when operably assembled, no portion of element 3 will be located within any U shape formed by element 8.

In direct contrast, the rejected claim 14, as herein, specifically recites a “flexible conductor arrangement” that “extends around” an “optoelectronic component.” In addition, the rejected claim 14, as amended herein, also specifically recites “an approximate U shape in the flexible conductor arrangement,” and that “at least a portion of the optoelectronic component is located within the approximate U shape of the flexible conductor arrangement.” At least because the Examiner has not demonstrated that *Kawaguchi* teaches “an approximate U shape in the flexible conductor arrangement” and a portion of an optoelectronic component “located within the approximate U shape of the flexible conductor arrangement” as recited in amended claim 14, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) of independent claim 14 be withdrawn.

### **C. Rejection of claims 1, 2, 8, 9, 10, 12 and 15 Under 35 U.S.C. §102e**

The Examiner rejects claims 1, 2, 8, 9, 10, 12 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by *Yoo, et al.* (United States Patent Publication No. 2003/0111701). Because *Yoo* does not teach or suggest each and every element of the rejected claims, Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection in view of the following remarks.

In rejecting claims 1, 2, 8, 9, 10, and 12 the Examiner states “*Yoo et al.* discloses ... an optical window (identified as a “transparent upper substrate”) 115 for light to enter or light to leave,...a flexible conductor arrangement (FCP) 216...wherein...the flexible conductor arrangement 216 defines, at least in the region of the optical window 115, a clearance for light to pass therethrough.” Office Action, pages 7-8. The Examiner cites figures 1 and 2 and paragraphs 0025-0027 and 0047 in support of this characterization of *Yoo*. However, it is clear from figures 2, 3, and 4 that element 216 does not define a clearance or opening through which light can enter or leave. Instead, an element labeled 230 defines an opening through which light can enter or leave. *See* figures 2, 3, and 4.

In direct contrast, as discussed above in Section B, the rejected claim 1, as amended herein, explicitly recites “a flexible conductor arrangement...wherein the flexible conductor

arrangement defines an opening through which light can enter or leave..." At least because the Examiner has not demonstrated that *Yoo* teaches a flexible conductor arrangement that "defines an opening through which light can enter or leave" as recited in amended claim 1, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) of independent claim 1, and dependent claims 2, 8, 9, and 10, be withdrawn.

In addition, because the cancellation of claim 12 herein has rendered the rejection of claim 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) moot, Application respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 12 be withdrawn.

In rejecting claim 15, the Examiner characterizes the element labeled 200 as a printed circuit board, the element labeled 216 as a flexible flat cable, and the element labeled 110 as an optoelectronic component. *See* Office Action, pages 8-9. The Examiner cites figures 1 and 2 and paragraphs 0025-0027 and 0047 in support of this characterization of *Yoo*. However, it is clear from the portions of *Yoo* cited by the Examiner that substantially the entire length and width of the side of element 110 that faces away from element 200 is not adjacent to element 216. *See* elements labeled 110, 200 and 216 in figure 2. Instead, only a minor portion of the length and width of element 110 is adjacent to element 216. *Id.*

In direct contrast, the rejected claim 15, as amended herein, explicitly recites "that substantially the entire length and width" of the side of the optoelectronic component that "faces away from the printed circuit board" is "adjacent" to a second end portion of the flexible flat cable. At least because the Examiner has not demonstrated that *Yoo* teaches a optoelectronic component where "substantially the entire length and width" of the side of the optoelectronic component that "faces away from the printed circuit board" is "adjacent" to a flexible flat cable as recited in amended claim 15, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) of independent claim 15 be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicant believes the claims as amended are in allowable form. In the event that the Examiner finds remaining impediment to a prompt allowance of this application that may be clarified through a telephone interview, or which may be overcome by an Examiner's Amendment, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney.

Dated this 3rd day of February, 2006.

Respectfully submitted,



ERIC L. MASCHOFF  
Registration No. 36,596  
Attorney for Applicant  
Customer No. 022913  
Telephone: (801) 533-9800

Title: ARRANGEMENT FOR CONNECTING THE  
TERMINAL CONTACTS OF AN  
OPTOELECTRONIC COMPONENT TO A  
PRINTED CIRCUIT BOARD

Inventor: Martin Weigert

Docket No.: 16274.6a.1 / Application No.: 10/817,583

Date of Office Action: 3 Oct 2005

ANNOTATED SHEET

FIG 9

Prior Art

